R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 696 UD 004 165

A WORKING PAPER ON PROBLEMS OF RACIAL IMBALANCE IN SCHOOLS.

BY- BUCHMILLER, A.A. TEITEL, MARTIN

PUB DATE MAY 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.04 24P.

DESCRIPTORS- *NORTHERN SCHOOLS, *RACIAL BALANCE, *COURT LITIGATION, *DEFACTO SEGREGATION, SCHOOL ZONING, SCHOOL REDISTRICTING, OPEN ENROLLMENT, BUS TRANSPORTATION, SCHOOL LOCATION, SCHOOL ORGANIZATION, RACIAL FACTORS, MIDDLE SCHOOLS, EDUCATIONAL COMPLEXES, MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN, REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION, CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, BOARDS OF EDUCATION, HIGHER HORIZONS, PRINCETON PLAN, ALLEN REPORT, NEW YORK STATE

THIS ANALYSIS OF NORTHERN DE FACTO SCHOOL SEGREGATION AND RACIAL IMBALANCE REVIEWS THE LEGAL ISSUES AND COURT DECISIONS GERMANE TO VARIOUS DESEGREGATION EFFORTS. IT IS NOTED THAT ALTHOUGH HOUSING PATTERNS MAY ACCOUNT FOR A LARGE PART OF THE RACIAL IMBALANCE IN SCHOOLS, GERRYMANDERING OF DISTRICT BOUNDARIES PLAYS A VERY SIGNIFICANT ROLE. SCHOOL BOARDS ATTEMPTING TO DESEGREGATE SCHOOLS ARE FACED WITH THE ISSUES OF WHAT THE LAW REQUIRES AND WHAT IT ALLOWS THEM TO DO ABOUT DE FACTO SEGREGATION. ACCORDING TO SEVERAL LEGAL DECISIONS, A SCHOOL BOARD MUST NOT ACT "ARBITRARILY" OR "UNREASONABLY" IN APPLYING POLICIES THAT USE RACE AS THE DETERMINING FACTOR IN DECIDING TO REORGANIZE A SCHOOL DISTRICT. THIS CRITERION APPLIES EQUALLY TO PLANS FOR PREDOMINANTLY WHITE SCHOOLS AS WELL AS TO NEGRO SCHOOLS. IN GENERAL, SCHOOL OFFICIALS USE SIX BASIC PLANS TO ALLEVIATE RACIAL IMBALANCE--REZONING, OPEN ENROLLMENT, BUSING, CONROLLED BALANCE INVOLVING A SPECIFIED RACIAL PERCENTAGE, SITE SELECTION, AND SCHOOL REORGANIZATION. THE MOST DRAMATIC PLANS PROPOSED ARE THOSE INVOLVING CHANGES IN THE FUNDAMENTAL STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. AN EXAMPLE OF SUCH A PLAN IS THE "4-4-4" PROPOSAL, RECOMMENDED IN THE ALLEN REPORT (NEW YORK STATE). REGARDLESS OF THE PLAN USED, HOWEVER, NEWLY INTEGRATED MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN OFTEN NEED SCHOLASTIC REMEDIATION AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT. ONE SUCH COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM WHICH THIS PAPER DISCUSSES IS NEW YORK CITY'S HIGHER HORIZONS PROJECT. PERTINENT LEGAL CASES ARE ALSO REVIEWED. (NH)

ED0166696

(?) FE 1039115 BR21 Acq. All Bib Items

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

04165

A WORKING PAPER ON PROBLEMS OF RACIAL IMBALANCE IN SCHOOLS

BY:
A. A. Buchmiller

Resource data developed by
Martin Teitel, Student, Univ. of Wisconsin

UD 004 165

DPI - May, 1966 - AAB

The problems of segregation and racial imbalance can be identified as being among the most sensative issues of our time. Legislated public school segregation in Northern communities is rarely found, yet in recent times, since the Supreme Court decisions of 1954[1], there have been many charges of de facto segregation and racial imbalance in Northern states, especially in cities and urban population centers.

In California, for example, minority group concentrations exceeding 85% in public schools occur in Los Angeles, Pasadena, Compton, Monrovia, Enterprise and Willowbrook. In Berkley, two elementary schools have pupil populations of over 90% Negro pupils.[2] This situation is not atypical of a number of large cities in the North: 28 elementary schools in Detroit's Center District are almost all Negro;[3] in Chicago, 87% of the city's Negro pupils (102,000) attend virtually all-Negro schools;[4] in New York City, out of 581 public elementary schools in the 1963-64 school year, 134 had at least 90% Negro-American and/or Puerto Rican pupils, while 186 schools were 90% White students.[5]

In terms of numbers, problems do exist in Northern cities. For example, there are more minority group residents in the South Side of Chicago than there are living in all of Little Rock.[6] New York City has the largest urban Negro-American community in the world. New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit each have twice as many Negroes as the largest cities of the South: New Orleans, Houston, Atlanta.[7]

Since World War II, there has been a general migration of Negroes northward. In 1930, 71% of America's Negroes lived in the eleven states of the Old Confederacy. In 1950, that figure was reduced to 60%, and, in 1960,

52%. This migration, coupled with another migration - the movement of whites to the suburbs, has left many Northern urban centers with problems of racial imbalance in the central city neighborhoods and the schools located within such neighborhoods.

Another factor in the increased public concern over de facto segregation in public schools is the alleged inferiority of many racially imbalanced schools. In New York City, 50.3% of the teachers in Negro-American and Puerto Rican elementary schools are fully licensed, compared to 78.2% in the predominantly white schools. In Chicago, 81% of the city's Negro elementary school pupils are involved with double sessions, although they comprise little more than one-third of the city's total school population. However, only 19% of the pupils in Chicago's "mixed" elementary schools are on double-session, and only 2% of the pupils attending "white" schools.[8]

RACIAL IMBALANCE AND LAW

Public school administrators, recognizing that some sort of racial imbalance problems do exist, may be uncertain what case the law has held concerning the responsibility of the public school system to relieve racial imbalance in the schools. Since Northern school segregation frequently is the result of segregated housing patterns, some administrators feel that there is little that they can do: "To the extent that it [segregation] results from purely private arrangements, it raises no Constitutional problems (The Constitution outlaws only governmental discrimination)."[9] However, very often courts have held school officials to be partly responsible for racial imbalance even when there was no such intention (such as in Clemens v. Board of Education of Hillsboro, Ohio, 228 F. 2d 853, 859 - 1956). Very often, this

interference on the part of school boards takes the form of gerrymandering school districts along racial lines, or selecting new school sites with identifiable racial factors in mind. In the historic New Rochelle, N.Y. decision (Taylor v. Bd. of Education of New Rochelle, N.Y., 191 Fed. Supp. 181, 192-195), the court struck down both the proposed transfer program and a new school site, and its whole policy regarding the neighborhood school: "The neighborhood school policy certainly is not sacrosanct. It is valid only insofar as it is operated within the confines established by the Constitution. It cannot be used as an instrument to confine Negroes within an area artifically delineated in the first instance by official acts . . ." The school boards' questions, then, about the law, fall into two broad categories: what the law requires them to do to alleviate de facto segregation, and what the law allows them to do.

The most basic court decisions are the Supreme Court decisions of 1954: Brown v. Bd. of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), and Bolling v. Sharp, 347 U. S. 497 (1954). These decisions called for a "prompt and reasonable start" towards compliance with the desegregation rulings. The Supreme Court, in a later ruling, wrote that school boards are "duty bound to devote every effort toward initiating desegregation and bringing about the elimination of racial discrimination in the public school system." (Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U. S. 1, 7 (1958). Another court wrote: "The opinion of the majority is that, in drawing the attendance lines for a school, it is not only within the power of the board to take into consideration the ethnic composition of the children therein, but that under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States it is the board's responsibility to do so in order to prevent the creation of a segregated public school." (Balaban v. Rubin,

20 A.D.2d at 440).* Other similar cases show some responsibility on the part of the school board to at least consider racial percentages when determining new districts and school sites: Branche v. Board of Education, Blocker v. Board of Education, and Jackson v. Pasadena School District.#

However, the courts do not always decide in favor of remedial procedutes or action, as is the case in Bell v. School City of Gary, Indiana, 213 F. Supp. 819 (N.D.Ind.). In this case the court ruled that the board had overstepped its authority by doing more than is allowed by law. The Commission on Civil Rights of the New York Bar Association recommends that if a school board has a duty to act towards reducing racial imbalance, it:

a) arises only in cases of extreme racial imbalance,

b) requires consideration of race as only one of many factors.[10]

The school is required to provide equal education for all, and as is seen above, this is not always the case. In 1958 some Negro-American parents kept their children out of school because of what they felt were inferior conditions, i.e., a smaller percentage of fully-licensed teachers, overcrowding, etc. School officials brought the parents to court, and the case was decided in favor of the defendants, the court writing that "The Constitution requires equality, not mere palliatives." (The Matter of Skipworth, 180 N.Y. S.2d 852.871 - 1958).

Legal action taken against school boards which have taken corrective action to relieve racial imbalance has largely been based on the contention that taking race into consideration when determining school population, or admitting or excluding children on account of race, violates the Federal and/or state discrimination laws. White parents sometimes charge that their children are being denied equal protection of the law. Generally,

the parents must establish that the school board acted "arbitrarily and unreasonably" by taking race into account. In Morean v. Board of Education, (42 N.J. 237 - 1964) the New Jersey Supreme Court ruled that the school administrators of Monclair, New Jersey, were not in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution when they closed a predominantly Negro school and reassigned its pupils to other schools, openly using race as a deciding factor in their decision to close the school. The Commission on Civil Rights of the N.Y. State Bar Association lists four general legal guidelines for school administrators regarding what is permissible:

1. School authorities are ordinarily afforded considerable latitude, as long as their action is not "arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable" -(such as Balaban v. Rubin, 20 App. Div ad at 450).
2. Other factors (eg. educational considerations, safety, cost, convenience, etc.) must be taken into account to avoid a ruling of "unreasonable." For example the New York State Supreme Court ruled that it was "arbitrary and unreasonable" to compel pupils to transfer from the school across the street from their home to one nearly a mile away - four trips per day over a few hazardous intersections. (Matter of Blumberg, N.Y.L.J. p.10, col. 7, 13 July, 1964).
3. The courts also consider the extremity of the racial imbalance in relation to the difficulty of taking corrective action.
4. Bussing, rezoning, and other methods need to be resolved by each school board according to the merits of the case, not on an a priori basis of arbitrary policy.

The Commission summarizes the legal situation with respect to school boards' action against racial imbalance in the following set of guides:[11]

> "A school board is forbidden, both constitutionally and by state law, to take action designed to segregate school children on the basis of race.
>
> Where no discriminatory intent exists, school officials are permitted to take reasonable corrective action aimed at reducing racial imbalance, even in the absence of any constitutional or state law requirement for such action.
>
> There appears to be emerging an affirmative duty requiring school authorities, even in the absence of discrimination, to take reasonable corrective action to alleviate extreme racial imbalance."

METHODS USED IN MODIFYING RACIAL IMBALANCE

When a school board has determined that some racial imbalance exists in its school system, and has decided to take some action to reduce or eliminate the problem, it almost by necessity must make three further decisions. First, the officials must select a method of working out their problem. Consideration must be given to the specific requirements of their individual situation: i.e. cost, legality, speed, etc. Secondly, they must decide on a program for the implementation of their plan which will create the least confusion, disorder, and public arousal. Thirdly, the school officials need to consider alternate follow-up plans to implement the effectiveness of their program. A number of plans or approaches have been employed to alleviate problems of racial imbalance.

DESEGREGATION PLANS

Six general basic plans are used by school officials to alleviate racial imbalance in schools. Others are possible by combining various elements of two or more of the basic plans. Many school officials find it best to use a combination of plans to meet their individual situation, or even to use one plan for one area of their city, and another plan for another area

with different basic conditions and requirements.

1. Rezoning. Gerrymandering of school district boundaries is one of the oldest methods of segregation in the North. It has also become one of the first areas of interest to those school officials interested in reducing racial imbalance in their school systems. Such a first step was taken by the New York City Board of Education towards the reduction of segregation in setting up the Central Zoning Unit. CZU was to work out new patterns for school districts, and plan for new schools, taking race into account whenever possible. As a result, from 1959-1963, the CZU made over one hundred changes in districts and school zones. The New Rochelle decision (see page 3) in 1961 was very important in establishing the legality of a rezoning plan. This decision struck down the gerrymandering of a New Rochelle, New York school district which had been arranged to keep the Negro-American students in one school. Another important case cited earlier, Balaban v. Rubin, involved the complaint of a group of white parents who objected to the Board's policy of taking race into account when deciding to redistrict certain white students into a new junior high school zone. The white parents maintained that the Board of Education violated Section 3201 of the New York State Education Law:

> "No person shall be refused admission into or excluded from any public school in the State of New York on account of race, creed, color or national origin."

The Supreme Court of Kings County, N.Y., upheld the white parents' suit and the rezoning was invalidated. The Board of Education appealed, and the Supreme Court reversed the finding of the lower

court, deciding that the Board did not act "arbitrarily, capriciously, or unreasonably . . . because board, in addition to other relevant matters, took into account in delimiting zone, factors of racial balance in the new school." The original zoning plan (the "Blodnick Plan"), was rejected because in providing for 52% Negro, 34% Puerto Rican and 14% white, a condition of racial imbalance would still exist. The plan that was finally accepted included one-third white pupil ratio in the school population.

The rezoning method has a number of problems. It seems to work best in an area where students have easy access to adjoining attendance centers or districts. In some areas rezoning simply can't bring in enough students from another racial group to make a significant difference, unless extensive provisions are made for mass transportation. Some parents and students resent leaving neighborhood areas and school attendance centers to attend schools remote from the area of residence. The plan seems to work best, when old buildings are being replaced with new structures and relocation permits greater racial balance in enrollment.

2. Open Enrollment. Open enrollment simply permits pupils to enroll in the school of their choice. It is practically impervious to legal attack, since race is not taken into account: white students may transfer out of Negro schools as freely as Negro students may transfer into white schools. Often, it is hard to get parents, especially those with younger children, to permit their children to travel the distance on public transportation that is necessary to reach a desired school.

New York instituted such a plan in 1961; as of February, 1964, 16,000 Negro school children had transferred - a fraction of New York's total school-aged Negro population, yet not an insignificant number. A disadvantage of the plan may be the fact that the children of more ambitious, more secure families tend to leave first, thereby draining already inferior schools of their more "talented" pupils. A further difficulty is the problem of making a single school program appealing to many ethnic, socio-economic and educational levels. When open enrollment was tried in Baltimore, 93 out of 193 schools were operating on a bi-racial basis after six years. The remaining segregation was attributed to housing patterns, not within the jurisdiction of school authorities.

Nashville, Tennessee tried a variation of the Baltimore Plan which was quickly held unconstitutional. Under this plan the pupil was permitted a choice between a racially segregated or a racially integrated school. In its decision, the court said: ". . . discrimination is clearly not eliminated by maintaining . . . some schools in the system on a racially segregated basis and others with the discrimination removed." (Kelly v. Board of Education of Nashville, 159 Fed. Supp. 272 - 1958).

The Dallas "Salt and Pepper Plan", providing for some white, some Negro, some mixed schools, was thrown out in a similar case, (Bosum v. Rippy, 85 F.2d 43 - 1960). The courts' view seemed to be that a plan for relieving racial imbalance must be a total all-encompassing plan; in the words of Wallace Mendelson, "To meet constitutional standards a desegregation plan must provide ultimately for full

desegregation."[12] (italics his).

3. Bussing. One of the most controversial of all plans to relieve racial imbalance in schools is "bussing." This procedure simply transports children out of a district composed predominantly of one race into a district containing mostly members of another race. It is probably the method that produces the greatest immediate results, without the political and legal complications that invariably insue when the problem is approached from the standpoint of zone change; in fact, bussing deliberately circumvents the problem of zone boundaries. This method is subject to the same legal precedents that cover the right of the school board to consider race when determining where a child shall attend school. (note the decision in Balaban v. Rubin).

However, there has been a great amount of resistance to this plan from both minority and majority group parents, as well as from educators. The parents' opposition is usually centered around the bussing - the actual traveling - rather than the integration that it is alleged to produce. Many parents, including minority parents, feel that their children should go to a nearby school, for the concept of the "neighborhood school" is a strong one in many communities. Parents also object to the time that must be spent on the bus, making the pupil's day longer and more tiring. Extra-curricular activities may be curtailed in order to meet the bus schedule. Other objections are raised: the high cost of maintaining a bus fleet, problems in achieving the actual integration once the bussed students arrive at the school, since, because of the schedule demands of the bus, the

'new-comers' must be treated specially in certain circumstances, thus aggrevating the separation between the 'new-comer' and the 'residents.'

Those favoring bussing point out that bussing is the quickest way of reducing racial imbalance in public schools; and that the peripheral problems of bussing, such as scheduling of extra-curricular activities, can be worked out by careful staff planning and in-service teacher orientation programs. One writer has gone so far to remark: " . . . Integration is impossible without bussing."[14]

The critics of this method of relieving racial imbalance in public schools use the following arguments:

1) Bussing is too expensive.
2) It breaks up neighborhoods, especially the "neighborhood school."
3) It not only does not achieve true integration, but it may actually foster animosity between the two groups involved.
4) In many areas of our large metropolitan areas (where racial imbalance is most evident), bussing would involve transportation of impossibly large numbers of students over very great distances. For example, it has been estimated that to achieve a fair amount of integration in Brooklyn, N.Y., 70,000 children would have to be transported ten miles twice a day[15] - a very expensive and long (in city traffic) trip.

It would seem then, that bussing requires careful investigation of community feelings toward the matter, as well as special planning

and teacher and student education programs.

4. Controlled Balance. Under this plan, pupils are assigned to schools using as a criterion the attainment of a specified racial percentage in the affected schools. An important legal precent for this method arose from Morean v. Board of Education of Montclair, 42 N.J. 237. This suit was brought against the suburban New Jersey town to challenge its right to re-assign pupils of a closed school to other local schools on the basis of race. The populations of the four Montclair junior highs involved were as follows:

Glenfield	90	
Hillside	60	(% of Negro pupils)
George Inness.....	18	
Mt. Hebron	0	

The Board of Education decided to close Glenfield Junior High, and instead of replacing it, re-assign its predominantly Negro student body to the three other schools, using a ratio primarily based on race. The Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey ruled in favor of the Board, holding that, (1) the School Board did not act "unreasonably and arbitrarily," and (2) that it was acting in order to secure the best educational opportunities for its pupils by trying to avoid the harmful consequences of racial segregation. This ruling is important, then for two reasons: it established the legality of the controlled balance method [no. (1) above], and it legally recognized the intrinsic detrimental effects of racial segregation in public schools for the pupils involved [no. (2) above].

A variation of this controlled balance method is the so-called Princeton Plan. This plan is perhaps most effectively applied to a small suburban community. The method involves the pairing of two schools, one primarily white, the other primarily Negro. The schools are divided "horizontally," that is, by grades, and then paired. Thus school "A" may contain grades K to 3, while school "B" would contain the remaining grades 4 to 6. This plan is deemed desirably by those using it because the administrators need only know the general make-up of a school or class. Thus, the individual pupils are not involved, avoiding humiliation for the students and legal problems for the administrators. Besides Princeton, New Jersey, this plan has also been used in the Greenburgh District of White Plains, New York; Benton Harbor, Michigan; and Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

Although the legality of the Princeton Plan was established by Addabo v. Donovan,[8] the plan's real sign of acceptance came in 1963 when the New York Board of Education, answering pressure from the NAACP, ordered the school board of Malverne, Long Island, to institute a school pairing plan along the lines of Princeton's.

5. Site Selection. This method involves choosing the site for a new school, using racial make-up of the proposed school as criterion in selecting the location of the school. The logical location for such a school, especially in large urban areas, is the "fringe area" between white and minority group communities. Two problems are generally associated with this method.

First, the population of fringe areas often tends to become more heavily minority populated, at least partly due to the migration to the suburbs. For example, a new junior high school was opened in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1957 having a composition which was 80% white and 20% non-white. By 1964 the population was 40% white, and 60% non-white. A second problem is that as promising pupils and teachers are drawn to the fringe, the "core area" tends to deteriorate, creating new problems in this area.

A possible solution to some of these objections is seen in the policy of the New York City School Board with regard to selection of sites in fringe areas: The plan is one of compromise, by favoring fringe areas for new schools, rather than building almost exclusively in these areas. The Board has announced that its long-range plan is to replace 22% of the predominantly Negro and/or Puerto Rican schools, but only 1% of the predominantly white schools. Of the 54 junior high schools opened from 1957-1959:

13 were in predominantly Negro and/or Puerto Rican areas,
17 were in predominantly white areas, and
24 were in mixed or "fringe" areas.

6. School Reorganization. The most sweeping and dramatic plans proposed have involved changes in the fundamental structure of the school system. On May 12, 1964, the New York State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions submitted a report ("The Allen Report"), which stated the following three objectives for the New York City school system to help relieve racial imbalance.

(1) Establish pre-primary classes.

(2) Abolish the junior high school system, and replace it with a primary-middle-high school sequence (4 years each.)

(3) Establish educational complexes ("school villages").

Once this "4-4-4" plan is established, the Committee recommended adoption of the following structure, utilizing several methods described above to relieve racial imbalance using varying methods to fit the situation:

High Schools:

include grades 9-12 (since 9th grade has highest percentage of minority group students in New York City).

plan location of new schools according to racial living patterns.

all schools to be opened to all students on a city-wide basis.

Middle Schools:

include grades 5 through 8.

locate, at first, in (renovated) old junior highs.

take pupils from several "feeder" schools, some white, some Negro.

making grade 8 "seniors" in that school would lower dropouts, delinquency.

Primary Schools:

include Kindergarten through 4th grade, and one or two pre-kindergarten levels.

should be non-graded, using team-teaching, variable grouping, etc., to allow pupils more individual attention and progress at own speed, thereby minimizing some cultural "handicaps".

In suburban areas, this plan takes the form of a "school village", which is similar to a college campus concept, including one or two high schools, a few middle schools, and several primary schools, plus common recreation, parking and library facilities. This plan is controversial, not only as a method of alleviating school segregation, but also as an over-all educational plan. Its proponents cite the flexibility, efficient use of facilities, potential use as a community center during non-school hours, and virtual elimination of racial imbalance problems, since all students in the community attend the same set of schools.

The arguments of the opponents of this plan center around the extreme cost of such a plan. The initial cost for land and plants is a great burden for many communities. Most children must be transported to the campus by bus, an additional expense, since the campus cannot be located in a "downtown" area because of the high real estate costs and the dangers caused by having a large number of school children concentrated in one area, surrounded by heavy traffic and industry. On a limited site, an idea of the scope of such a project is included in a report of the American Association of School Administrators[16] which estimates that a city of 100,000 (10,000-20,000 pupils) would have the following requirements for a school village:

2 large senior highs

4 intermediate schools

8 primary schools

16 kindergarten-nursery pre-primary schools

plus outdoor play area, parking, buffer area:

240 acres: TOTAL LAND REQUIREMENT

CATCHING UP

Once the school authorities have recognized their problem, decided on a program to try to relieve the problem, and implemented the plan, the situation often is not totally resolved. Further plans must be made to provide remedial help in scholastic and cultural areas and also in social and psychological areas. Minority group children frequently come from so-called "inferior" schools, and their family backgrounds are often not conducive for cultural stimulation. Children oftentimes need comprehensive psychological counseling and guidance programs. Programs need to be instituted to aid newly-integrated minority group students to compete more effectively with their peers. Some of the more well-known successful programs are:

Supervised Home Study Program, San Antonio, Texas

The Montgomery County Project, Montgomery County, Maryland

Career Clubs (Careers Unlimited), Phoenix, Arizona

Phelps Stokes Program (a study from a Rockefeller Foundation grant)

The Banneker Program, St. Louis, Missouri

Higher Horizons, New York City

Dillard University Program (summer program)

Other cities with some sort of "catch-up" program: (Ford Foundation grants): Cleveland, Milwaukee, Chicago, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Pittsburg, San Francisco, Washington, D. C.[17]

One of the first of these plans was a pilot program in New York City instituted in 1956, called the "Demonstration Guidance Project." This program was the direct forerunner of the Higher Horizons Program in New York and served as a pattern for many of the projects listed above, therefore, it serves as a good illustrative example of the typical catch-up program.

The Demonstration Guidance Project (DGP) was centered in Harlem's Junior High No. 43, a school of 1,400 students, with the following percentages: 48% Negro, 38% Puerto Rican, and 14% Continental white. About 700 students were selected for the program, on the basis of IQ and achievement tests. The purpose of the program was to provide a saturation program of remedial educational and cultural enrichment, as well as psychological support to raise the level of achievement and aspiration among the "culturally deprived" children. The staff of the DGP included: 3 full-time guidance counselors, 2 teachers of remedial math, one half-time teacher for educational and cultural enrichment, one secretary, one administrative assistant, and a part-time psychologist, psychiatrist, and social worker. In addition, the following personnel, already employed by the school, were assigned to the project: 2 remedial reading teachers, a Puerto Rican "Coordinator", an attendance and behavior counselor, and a part-time speech counselor.

The program provided for:

-- small classes

-- double periods of English daily

-- special attention for slower students

-- activities to acquaint parents with nature and purpose of the project

-- individual counseling

-- weekly group guidance sessions

-- "cultural enrichment" excursions to West Point, Hyde Park, local colleges, plays, concerts, ballets, etc.

The results based on October 1956 to April 1959 statistics indicate:

- an average increase of 7.7 points (95-102.5) in IQ

- an increase in reading ability: (October, 1956 - median 1 year 4 months below average. April, 1959 - median 3 months above average.)
- improved high school performance: (5 out of 105 graduates of Junior High No. 43 who went to high school passed all academic subjects, in 1953; in their first year of high school, 38% of DGP students passed all of their subjects; and nearly half had academic averages over 80%. (1959))

The program was modified and extended to other schools and other grade levels, and included all culturally deprived children, not just those scoring well in achievement and IQ tests. The project is still in operation, being expanded under the name of "Higher Horizons" Project.

A COMPLETE PROGRAM

No single plan or method can effectively deal with the problem of racial imbalance in our schools. The community and school administrator of each school district must first determine the unique needs of the community. Investigation should be made of the various plans available and which fits the practical and legal requirements of the situation. A specific plan must be formulated, using one, a few, or a combination of methods for improving the racial imbalance of the school system. Finally, the plan must be implemented, working along with the principals,teachers, parents, civic groups and the students themselves as follow-up programs are developed.

[1] Most notably Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 US 483 (1954) and Bolling v. Sharp, 347 US 497 (1954).

[2] Wallace Mendelson, Discrimination, p. 48.

[3] ibid.

[4] W. Maslow and R. Cohen, School Segregation, Northern Style, p. 3.

[5] M. Dector, The Negro and the New York Schools, p. 3.

[6] Maslow and Cohen, p. 1.

[7] ibid. p. 2.

[8] ibid. p. 6.

[9] Mendelson, p. 47.

[10] Report of the Committee on Civil Rights of the New York State Bar Association, p. 8.

[11] ibid, p. 10.

[12] p. 36.

[13] Dector, p. 9.

[14] ibid. p. 8.

[15] M. M. Tumin, Desegregation, p. 13.

[16] American Association of School Administrators, School Racial Policy, p. 26.

[17] Most of these programs are described in some detail in Mendelson's Discrimination, pp. 50-59.

[18] This and the following statistics on the DGP are from Maslow and Cohen's School Segregation, Northern Style, pp. 18-20.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of School Administrators, School Racial Policy, (Washington, D. C., 1966).

Blaustein, A.P. and Ferguson, C.C. Desegregation and the Law (New Brunswick, N.J., 1957).

* Dector, M. "The Negro and the New York Schools" (Reprinted from Commentary magazine, September 1964).

Gates, R. The Making of Massive Resistance (Chapel Hill, 1962).

Giles, H.H. The Integrated Classroom (New York, 1959).

Hill, H. and Greenburg, J. Citizen's Guide to Desegregation (Boston, 1955).

Klopf, G.J. and Laster, I.A. (ed.) Integrating the Urban School (New York 1963).

Knox, E.O. Democracy and the District of Columbia Schools (Washington, D.C., 1957).

Maslow, W. and Cohen R. School Segregation, Northern Style (Public Affairs Committee) (New York, 1961).

Mendelson, Wallace, Discrimination (Englewood-Cliffs, N.J., 1962) Based on the report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights).

New York State Bar Association, Committee on Civil Rights, "Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools: The Current Status of Federal and New York Law" (New York, 1964).

New York State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, "Desegregation in the Public Schools of New York City" (New York, 1964).

New York State Department of Education, The Status of Desegregation in New York State (mimeographed pamphlet.)

Norfleet, M.B. Forced School Integration in the U.S.A. (New York, 1961).

Suchman, E., Dean, J., Williams, R. Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions (New York, 1958).

Tumin, M.M. Desegregation (Princeton, N.J., 1958).

University of the State of New York, State Education Department. "Some Suggested Teacher References . . ." (Mimeographed pamphlet)

Wey, H. and Corey, J. Action Patterns in School Desegregation: A Guidebook, (Bloomington, Ind., 1959).

ADDENDA

* Balaban v. Rubin, 20 App. Div.2d 438 (2d Dep't 1964), aff'd 14 N.Y. 2d 193 (1964), cert, denied, 33 U.S.L. Weel 3141 (October 19, 1964).

≠ Branche v. Board of Education, 204 F. Supp. 150 (E.D. N.Y. 1962).

Blocker v. Board of Education, supra, at 230.

Jackson v. Pasadena City School District, supra, 382 P. 2d at 610.

$ Addabbo v. Donavan, N.Y.L.J., p.10. col.3, July 15, 1964.